DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 591 95 CE 011 635

AUTHOR Walsh, John
TITLE Crucial Issues Pertaining to the Establishment of Community-Education Work Councils.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 76
CONTRACT 400-76-0118
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Advisory Committees; Agency Role; *Citizens Councils; Community Organizations; Community Responsibility; *Educational Opportunities; Financial Support; Government Role; Labor Problems; Labor Unions; Pilot Projects; *School Community Cooperation; *School Community Relationship; *School Industry Relationship; Vocational Education; Youth Employment

ABSTRACT

This paper is one of a series related to various aspects of a pilot project to establish community-education work councils composed of educators, employers, local union representatives, and representatives of community organizations or of the general public. Following a historical overview of the relationship between industry and education and between labor and education, the paper is organized into three sections. Section I discusses some of the major ideas and assumptions underlying the proposed establishment of community work-education councils and identifies seven crucial issues that relate to the youth unemployment rate, adult education opportunities, collaboration vs. cooperation, definition of community, council funding, community interest, and responsibility for establishing councils. Section II contains a review of existing mechanisms similar to the proposed councils. Section III places the seven issues into four main categories and discusses each: Community interest, the question of isolation, the question of poor preparation, and the Federal role. (LMS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the micrcfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141591 JUN 30 1977

CRUCIAL ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY - EDUCATION WORK COUNCILS

by

John Walsh

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared for the National Institute of Education Under Contract No: 400-76-0118

November 1976

CE 011 635

The work reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the author and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the United States Government.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this paper involved the review of a considerable amount of literature and personal and telephone interviews with 25 government, trade association, labor, and industry/labor/education council officials. Without the help of Ms. Jan L. Totten, who performed much of the initial research, the paper could not have been completed within the time allotted for its preparation. Ms. Totten performed her work diligently and with exceptional thoroughness.

I would also like to express my appreciation to all the officials with whom Ms. Totten and I talked during the research phase of the project. All gave freely of their time and were open in their discussion of the issues involved with regard to the proposed establishment of community-work education councils.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgement	ii
Introduction	1
Section I: Ideas and Assumptions	14
Section II: What's Going On	29
Section III: Crucial Issues	65
Notes	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Instructional Services Provided for Schools (by Employers)..... 32

Table 2: Help in Upgrading Teachers (by Employers)..... 33

Table 3: Company Willingness to Initiate Action on Education and Training Problems..... 34

INTRODUCTION

Background

Since World War II, the nation has experienced mass migrations of both industries and people, the almost total mechanization of agriculture, dramatic technological changes in business and industry, the expansion of metropolitan areas (in which most of the people now live), ever-increasing centralization of major industries, and expansion in both the educational establishment and in educational opportunities. It is perhaps inevitable that in the face of such rapid change, the conditions upon which past relationships between schools and other institutions were based have disappeared, and that new means -- based on current conditions -- to improve the nexus between education and the larger community (especially between schools and the work sector) have been sought. The search has been conducted, with varying degrees of intensity, during the entire period of change, and has resulted in considerable activity from the local to national levels.

For example, it is estimated that more than 100,000 representatives of business and industry are presently members of formally organized vocational education advisory committees, additional thousands serve on Joint Apprenticeship Committees and as advisors to individual instructors of vocational education programs, and approximately 4.5 million employers and 40,000 national, regional and local business and industrial associations and labor groups are presently providing materials and voluntary services to the educational

system.[1] A recent study indicates that of the 90,000 members of school boards, serving 15,780 educational jurisdictions throughout the nation, 59,400 (or about two out of three) are representatives of management.[2] Since 1943, the number of vocational education advisory councils and committees has increased ten-fold,[3] and since the 1960s, variously named planning and advisory councils relating both to federally sponsored manpower programs and federally mandated educational programs have mushroomed by the thousands.

Despite this proliferation of mechanisms designed to improve communications between schools and the larger community (especially the work sector), the charge is still made -- indeed, is being made more forcefully than ever before -- that one of the major reasons youth have difficulities in making the transition from school to work and adults are inhibited from moving from work back into school is the "isolation" of education from other institutions at the community level. Willard Wirtz best sums up the charge in the first paragraph of The Boundless Resource:

> "A good deal of American achievement traces in one way or another to the development of Education and Work as coordinate forces. They have, however, been distinctly separate developments controlled by independent sovereignities -- with the consequence that in most people's lives learning and earning pass as totally isolated chapters (emphasis added)."[4]

The same theme is reiterated almost daily by representatives of the higher echelons of government, education, labor, industry and other institutions. It would appear that there is an overwhelming consensus among the "isolated institutions" that they should in some

way get together and end their isolation. Closer examination, reveals, however, that the consensus exists only in the generality that more substantial linkages are desirable; when the talk gets down to specifics, consensus generally breaks down. School Boards and educators want help and advice, which they can either accept or ignore, but they are cool to the suggestion that educational policy and program decisions be shared with non-educators. Labor unions, although generally supportive of the public schools, often take a dim view of work education programs in areas of high unemployment, and balk at suggestions that the Fair Labor Standards Act and other similar state legislation be modified to permit increased employment of youth. Business and industry often appear to be promoting their own specialized interests -- the promotion of free enterprise and the preparation of students for jobs in the business and industrial complex -- to the exclusion of all other educational activities.

These are what Wirtz calls the areas of "tension," but as he notes: "...productive tension is probably an essential element in constructive change."[5/] Nevertheless, the historical and current factors which contribute to tension should be understood if the alleged isolation of institutions is to be eased. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a detailed history of the relationships between education, industry, labor and other institutions, a brief summation of some of the major tensions which have existed throughout U.S. history, and still exist today, would lend clarity to the discussion which follows.

Industry-Education

Although industry's attempts to influence education were minor

during the middle to latter parts of the 19th century, the amount of education most students received was limited by the labor demands of business and industry -- which is another way of saying that industry actually did exert control. As Wirtz points out, "the education that was the subject of principle consideration in the mid-19th century was largely elementary learning, covering only those essentials that had to come in the beginning." The amount of education necessary was about 10 years, "which happened to coincide with the physiology of the strengthening of a boy's arm and back muscles and a girl's coming of child bearing age."[6/]

Industry was a prime mover in the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 -- in fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was one of its major champions -- but regardless of how necessary a national program of vocational education may have been (and still is), industry's motives in promoting the legislation were not altogether altruistic. The Act was directed primarily toward the children of immigrants and tenant farmers and sharecroppers in rural areas. Its purpose was to prepare boy's for work in the nation's factories, mines, mills and farms, and girls -- through home economics courses -- for work as housekeepers, nurse-maids and cooks in other people's homes. It was only recently, for example, that blacks have been enrolled in vocational education programs <u>other</u> than agriculture and home economics.

Industry dominated Boards of Education in "company towns" were primarily interested in turning out disciplined young workers for the towns' mines, mills and factories.

Indeed, the liberal reformers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries worked actively to reduce industry's influence on education, and to a great extent they succeeded, thus possibly contributing to

today's "isolation."

The uneasy relationship between industry and education continues today. Some educational commentators believe that industry controls the schools -- through overwhelming representation on boards of education, through domination of curricula as represented by production of textbooks and educational hardware, and through pressure on schools to prepare youth for jobs and careers in industry. According to Percy Krich:

> "...industry is a potential threat to education's leadership in preparing future citizens. 'Industry and Education' implies a relationship between them as equals. The real question is whether there is an equality relationship between them....As an educator, I must determine true relationships by facing reality. One can 'develop attitudes' toward industry, but one must face the fact that industry (big business) has more control and impact on society than the schools. Through this impact, big business, in essence, controls the schools as well."7/

Although most educators would not line up behind Krich, his statement does illustrate the wariness that characterizes education's attitudes toward industry participation in school affairs. The suspicion, however, is mutual. Industry, for its part, suspects that in many instances, educators are hostile to the free enterprise system, and that they pass this hostility on to their students.

Labor Unions

Organized labor has a long history of support of public education as well as involvement in vocational education. Some 500 members of

the AFL-CIO serve on boards of education, and AFL-CIO publications occasionally carry articles encouraging members to participate in local and state public education matters and to support increased federal aid to all facets of public education. However, union support of education often is no more altruistic than that of other special interest groups, including employers. For example, a major activity of the AFL-CIO Education Department is to promote utilization of its text and other literature dealing with the union movement in social studies, civics and history classes, and as more and more public school teachers become union members, it can be predicted that labor education materials in the schools will find greater acceptance. Furthermore, unions have taken a dim view of the expansion of work education programs, especially in areas of high unemployment, and where programs are initiated without being first cleared through union representatives. Finally, the elimination of child labor, and the establishment of the eight-hour day and forty-hour week were among the goals of the American labor movement for a century before they were established as norms by the wage and hour legislation of the 1930s. It is, therefore, closely akin to sacrilege -- especially in a period of high unemployment -- to ask labor leaders to agree to a relaxation of these laws in order to increase employment opportunities for youth.

The Concept of "Youth"

The concept of what constitutes "youth" has changed in the United States over the years, and this change has brought about a new role for education. Joseph F. Dinneen, in his biography of James Michael Curley, the late perennial mayor of Boston, noted the following:

> "The age limit children must reach, before being freed of legal obligation to attend school, was not raised because ward or city bosses thought education was good for them. It was raised to solve a different problem. As the population increased, a labor shortage disappeared and a labor surplus was created. A time came when the ward bosses found it difficult to keep heads of families employed, let alone their children. When the pressure of hundreds of voting fathers for jobs for their children became disturbing, and in some ways frightening, political bosses seized upon compulsory education as an expedient. Keeping children in school until they reached the age of 16 would defer the problem of finding work for them until the bosses found a way to cope with the problem; and they hoped education might solve it by giving children enough training to find jobs for themselves."[8/]

Thus, when the demand for younger workers decreased, education was assigned the task of keeping children <u>out</u> of the labor market, as well as preparing them for entry into it. Stephen P. Heyneman and William P. Daniels, summarizing an HEW workshop on youth research, which included participation by representatives of some of the most eminent juvenile research institutions in the United States, write: "The size of the class of individuals called 'youth' is directly and inversely proportional to their demand in the labor market: the more the demand, the less the number of youth; the more the demand, the less they can be spared, and the more pressure there is for them to enter economic roles identical with adults."[9/] Since World War II, the years of "youth" have been extended at a rapid rate. In

James Michael Curley's day, "youth" often ended at the end of the eighth grade; today it can extend up to 25 years of age and beyond. "With this first youth generation (the post-World War II generation) now well integrated into the highest reaches of our technocracy," Heyneman and Daniels report, "the age range of 'youth' keeps getting extended upward. Perhaps it will ultimately be defined as interminable.... ...If there is another general depression, then those who are considered youth will be coterminal with those who are considered adolescents....We don't simply observe youth as a category in the life cycle. We create it, just as we create many other social categories that we place ourselves in."[10/] And, the proper place for youth, of course, is "in school."

Regardless how far upward the age range of youth has been extended, however, some students are still dropping out of school before they complete high school, high school graduates are entering the labor market at the age of 18, and students who continue on to postsecondary schools after graduating from high school nevertheless seek full-time and part-time jobs. The youth employment rate is the highest of any group in the labor force, and it is particularly high for blacks and other minorities. There also appears to be a gap for students who complete their schooling at age 18 or under and the age (generally 21) when they are accepted for employment in regular entry-level positions (jobs other than those that appear to be reserved specifically for youth). These factors, plus alleged restrictions which inhibit adults from seeking retraining or additional education, have led to a reexamination of the relationship between schools and other institutions in the nation's communities.

The opinion of many is that a polarization exists between

institutions, and proposals have been put forward to alleviate this condition. In discussing these proposals, however, it is necessary to keep in mind the history of education in the United States and the special interests -- whether they be of business and industry, labor, the family, the Church, and other segments of society, which have sought in the past (and have often succeeded) in influencing the education of American children. As for the educational establishment, it has often been charged that in recent years it has been transformed into a huge bureaucracy which is primarily interested in self-perpetuation. While there may be some truth in the charge, it is equally true that at one time in our history it was considered desirable for education to disassociate itself from the "special interests," and that a disproportionate share of the responsibility for solving some of our more pressing social problems (including the care of youth until the economy is able to absorb them into the labor force) has been assumed, or imposed on, the nation's system of public education. In her book, Counterpoint, Miriam Johnson criticizes the Employment Service, not for failing to accomplish the impossible, but for claiming that it could accomplish the impossible.[11/] The same criticism could be made of the nation's educational system.

Perhaps, then, the pendulum has swung all the way back, and the time is ripe for our institutions to recognize their interdependence, and join together in solving the social problems which afflict the nation; however, if such joint efforts are to be successful, the agenda must move quickly from the general to the specific, and the action areas selected must be aimed at substantive, rather than peripheral, problems.

Community Work-Education Councils

One of the proposed solutions for breaking down the isolation between education and other institutions at the community level is the formation of community work-education councils, composed of educators, employers, local union representatives, and representatives of community organizations, or of the general public itself. The idea, as described in The Boundless Resource, is based on the following assumptions:

1. The difficulties that youth experience in making the transition from school to work, and that adults experience in moving from work and other adult roles back into education, are caused primarily by the isolation that exists between schools and other community institutions (especially business and industry).
2. The solution is "collaboration" between institutions at the community level.

The proposed councils would differ from existing advisory councils or committees in that the "process" would be collaborative rather than cooperative. Paul Barton defines the term "collaborative" as follows:

> "....the participation of the representatives of the important institutions and sectors of the community that have the responsibility, resources, and influence to deal with the whole of the transition to regular adult employment. It means an attempt to accomplish jointly what could not be achieved singly, and a whole that is larger than the sum of its parts."12/

Thus, collaboration means the actual participation of council members in the "process" of narrowing the gap between school and work (and work and school), rather than the mere imparting of advice by non-educators to educators. Kenneth Hoyt goes farther than Barton in defining collaboration:

> "Collaboration is a term that implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making....Cooperation, on the other hand, is a term that assumes two or more parties, each with separate and autonomous programs, agree to work together in making all such programs more successful. To "cooperate" with another agency or organization carries no implication that one either can, or should, affect its policies or operational practices."13/

Hoyt's definition implies that for true "collaboration" to take place, educators would have to share at least some of their policy making and operational responsibilities with other sectors of the community, and that other community institutions and organizations would have to assume new responsibilities.

The suggested activities of the proposed Community-Work Education Councils, as broadly outlined by Barton, are as follows:

1. Programs or action to bring about the integration of experience with education;
2. Counseling assistance drawing broadly on community resources;
3. Placement assistance and follow-up;
4. Information for career choice;
5. Systematic exposure of counselors and teachers to the

nature of work;

6. Reduction of barriers that may exist that impede the transition from school to work and from work to school;
7. Attitude formation of students to work, and industry to students and high school graduates; and
8. Promoting understanding of the work world and how the local economy operates.[14/]

A pilot project has been launched by the U.S. Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, and Commerce to increase collaboration at the community level. A contract has been entered into between the Department of Labor and the National Manpower Institute, a private, non-profit corporation, to establish a work-education consortium of 15 communities and the involvement of 15 other communities where collaborative efforts already exist. The National Institute of Education, in order to anticipate the role the Department of Health, Education and Welfare may play with regard to the pilot project, has commissioned a series of papers relating to various aspects of the proposed Community-Work Education Councils, of which this paper is one.

Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of the paper is to identify crucial issues pertaining to the establishment of Community-Work Education Councils which are deserving of policy consideration and on which priorities for future research and/or evaluation could be based. A review was made of literature pertaining to past and current mechanisms similar to the proposed community-work education councils, and personal and telephone interviews were conducted with chairmen of existing industry/labor/education councils, and with representatives of government business,

industrial and labor groups. Following the research phase of the project, the attempt was made to: (1) categorize past and current efforts by type (goals, methods of operation, membership, etc.); (2) identify the outcomes of such efforts (if any); and (3) identify problems associated with each type of council or committee.

The material that follows is organized into three sections: (1) A discussion of some of the major ideas and assumptions underlying the proposed establishment of community-work education councils; (2) a review of existing mechanisms similar to the proposed councils; and (3) a summary of the crucial issues relating to the pilot project now in progress.

I.

IDEAS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Cameron Buchanan, in a discussion of current proposals to improve education-work linkages -- including the establishment of community-work education councils, notes: "....it is not immediately clear to many educators and industrial personnel exactly what is meant by the rather high level discussion and very generalized approach presented in these typical documents. It is thought that a more particularized view point is needed in order to better find out what is meant and its applicability level. Although these proposed and recommended new models and means might be considered necessary, it is not definitely shown that this is the case to the agreement of all concerned. It is possible to indicate that the perceived inconsistencies in these documents tend to show *desire* more than *need*" (emphasis added).[1/]

Buchanan's statement goes right to the heart of the problem. Some students *are* experiencing difficulties in making the transition from school to work, there *are* impediments which prevent adults from reenrolling in educational programs, and it *is* desirable that something be done about these problems. However, we had better be certain as to what the causes of these problems are before potential solutions are identified, and before the solutions are tried, they should be worked out in detail. With respect to the proposed community-work education councils, there is considerable confusion with regard to the stated causes of youth unemployment and impediments

to adult educational renewal, and with the proposed means for overcoming these problems. Some of the more important of these issues are discussed below.

Causes of Youth Unemployment

Sar A. Levitan and Robert Taggart cite three major reasons for the nation's high youth unemployment rate: (1) Too many job seekers; (2) too few jobs; and (3) institutional impediments (mainly legal restrictions).[2/] The economics of youth unemployment are well known; it is sufficient to note that there is considerable statistical support for the first two reasons. With respect to institutional impediments, the authors cite the Fair Labor Standards Act and similar state legislation which inhibit the employment of some youth between the ages of 14 and 18. However, even if these impediments were removed, the unemployment rate for youth would not be affected unless there was a concurrent improvement in economic conditions. In other words, the major cause of high youth unemployment is economic -- too few jobs for too many job seekers.

Levitan and Taggart also observe: "Employers are reluctant to hire teenagers when older workers are available. In many cases their reasons are valid, but too frequently failure to hire youth is the result of arbitrary discrimination."[3/]

Regardless whether or not the failure to hire youth is arbitrary discrimination, the fact is that there are not enough jobs for all jobseekers. If discrimination against youth were to end tomorrow, we would have a new problem on our hands -- higher unemployment rates for non-youth.

Thus, one of the basic assumptions upon which the proposed establishment of community-work education councils is based -- i.e., youth unemployment is caused by the isolation of education from the work sector -- is at best dubious and at worst false. Care should be taken that for the sake of doing something -- anything -- we don't train our guns on the wrong target. Education is everybody's "fall guy," but education does not have the power to increase the number of jobs in the U.S. economy; neither do the proposed community-work education councils. The fact is that youth unemployment is rooted in economic causes and cannot be solved through manipulation of the educational system. The probability that the schools could do a better job in preparing students for the world of work does not invalidate this basic truth.

Work to School Problems

In justifying the hypothesis that adults are impeded from moving from work and other adult roles back into education and training <u>because</u> of the isolation factor, Paul Barton lists 11 supporting statements. These range from descriptions of unemployment insurance restrictions (which prohibit unemployed workers from enrolling in retraining or other educational programs) to a lack of communications between postsecondary school administrators and employers. The important question, however, is whether the demand for reenrollment in educational programs is real or imaginary. Obviously, the proponents of community-work education programs believe that there <u>should</u> be demand for educational renewal, and that there <u>would</u> be such a demand in the best of all possible worlds. Barton notes, however, that some employers and unions have negotiated tuition

refunds and educational sabbatical plans, "but where they exist they are taken advantage of by only a small percentage of workers."[4] Along the same vein, a recent study of apprenticeship programs in Rhode Island and California reported that where unions had instituted expensive retraining programs (financed out of contributions from management), the facilities were underutilized. Business agents of the ironworkers union in Rhode Island and the compositors in California reported that few employed journeymen took advantage of the programs, and that most men on the bench -- even those who were lacking in some basic skills -- could not be enticed to enroll.[5] Previous to the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act, the California legislature eased "availability for work" restrictions for unemployment insurance recipients in order that long-term unemployed workers could enroll in education and training programs and still receive unemployment insurance. Very few workers took advantage of the opportunity.

It would appear, therefore, that the major reason that adults do not reenroll in school is because they don't want to. Why this is true, nobody knows for sure, but what it all adds up to is a lack of demand. If there were a mass demand for adult education and retraining programs -- over and above those that already exist (which are considerable) -- the chances are that whatever impediments exist would soon disappear. It may be true that community-work education councils could <u>stimulate</u> a demand for educational renewal and remove whatever local impediments may exist, but it is something else again to justify the establishment of such councils on an alleged isolation of institutions at the community level.

Collaboration

The main distinction between the proposed community-work education councils and school-community mechanisms that already exist is in the "process," i.e., the proposed councils would involve "collaboration" between institutions and agencies, whereas most existing mechanisms involve merely "cooperation." Until specific areas of collaboration are identified, however, this distinction will remain in the realm of semantics. The fact is, as will be shown in Section II, many of the suggested activities of community-work education councils are already being performed by existing advisory and other types of councils. Whether the process by which these activities are conducted is "collaborative" or "cooperative" depends pretty much on the eye of the beholder. Is the provision of job stations by employers for cooperative education students "collaborative" or "cooperative?" Is the provision of local labor market information by state employment security agencies to local CETA prime sponsors "collaborative" or "cooperative?" Were the inventories of community manpower programs and educational opportunities developed in the past by Cooperative Area Manpower and Planning Committees "collaborative" or "cooperative?" All these are suggested activities for the proposed community-work education councils.

The crucial question concerning collaboration is whether schools will be willing to share policy making and operational responsiblities with other community organizations and agencies, and whether non-educational organizations and institutions will be willing to assume new responsibilities for educational programs. The answer to this question can be determined only if specific activities are identified which are uniquely suited to "collaboration." For example, would

the schools be willing to abide by council decisions relating to vocational education occupational offerings? Thus, if the council decided that course "A" should be discontinued and course "B" should be established, would the schools be willing to: (1) put in storage all the equipment now being used in course "A", (2) dismiss the teacher of course "A", (3) purchase new equipment for course "B", and (4) hire a new instructor for course "B"? Or, if the council decided that a new course should be initiated, would employers allow the course to be taught in employer facilities, using employer equipment? And would the schools agree to such a procedure?

These are the hard questions and there are many more. Would the schools, for example, agree to initiate work education programs only after they had been approved by labor representatives -- and would employers agree to such a procedure? Would labor go along with attempts to modify federal, state and local child labor and minimum wage legislation in order to increase employment opportunities for youth?

The point is that the distinction between collaboration and cooperation means nothing until specific council activities are identified. Some of the suggested council activities do not require any high degree of collaboration; some do. The crucial question is whether councils will chose to act in areas where collaboration is necessary.

The Meaning of Community

The term "community" can mean almost anything anyone wants it to mean. A community can be a family, a neighborhood, a town or city, a county, a state, a nation, or even a group of nations. The

term "local community" can mean anything from a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) to a city neighborhood. Because some of the major suggested activities of community-work education councils would involve "jurisdictions," it is important that the concept of community be understood. For example, two of the suggested activities are the generation of local labor market information, and placement activities for school graduates and work education students. In the case of a council located within an SMSA, would the jurisdictions for these activities be the entire SMSA, a county within the SMSA, a city within a county within an SMSA, or a neighborhood within a city within a county within an SMSA? Or would a community be a local education agency, community college district, or a local employment office jurisdiction?

The concept of community would also determine the membership of councils. In large SMSAs, it is likely that there would be more than one council, leading to the question of how employers, labor representatives, and other state and community agency representatives would be shared. In areas where there is more than one council, or where there are other agencies (such as CETA prime sponsors) engaged in generating local labor market information and placement activities, would there be a need to coordinate the coordinators?

Perhaps the term "community," as it is used in The Boundless Resource and the Barton paper is merely an undefined descriptive for locations in which councils already exist, but when it comes to selecting activities for the various "communities," the question of jurisdiction and overlap with other mechanisms (such as CETA prime sponsors, Boards of Education, local Employment Service Office areas, and advisory committees) would have to be taken into consideration.

Local Financing

Paul Barton, in discussing the pilot project now being conducted by the National Manpower Institute, poses the question: "Would it be a contradiction for a Federal presence in a local community to urge local, and heavily private initiative? The answer was that it would not be a contradiction if the Federal role was limited to encouragement, if it were not clearly a federally funded 'program' that would make communities think it was just another avenue for obtaining Federal support, and if non-Federal and non-government instrumentalities were involved in direct relationships with the communities, and with counterpart organizations within the communities."[6]

The fact is, however, that federal funds will be used to help finance the councils included in the project sample and the proposed consortium. Thus, regardless how desirable it would be to ignore or downplay the federal presence, a federal presence will nevertheless be felt. In selecting existing councils or mechanisms to be included in the consortium, what types of local financing will be required? Should there be a mix of private and public funds? Should councils be avoided that are financed solely from one source (e.g., employers, labor unions, education)? Would not "collaboration" involve joint funding of councils, in order that no one segment of the community would exert undue influence on council policy and activities? The answers to these questions are not forthcoming from the architects of the community-work education council idea. Yet, if the federal presence is to be minimized, the question as to what constitutes local financing -- whether it be broad-based or solely from one or two institutions -- would be crucial.

Council Authority

The question of local financing leads directly to an even more important issue. The proposed councils would be operating alongside Boards of Education (usually elected by the voters in local communities and financed out of local tax funds), variously constituted advisory committees and councils (made up of representatives of local employers, labor union representatives, educators and others -- and financed out of local funds), and other duly constituted entities, funded out of local, federal and state funds. Where would community-work education councils fit into this maze? And from what base would they receive their power to influence, their "legitimacy?" Who or what institutions would establish the councils? Perhaps at this time the latter question is moot, since existing entities will be selected for participation in the pilot project, but in the long run, these questions are very much to the point.

In discussing these issues with directors of industry education councils who are hoping to receive funds from the pilot project, it became clear that by being selected for participation in the pilot project, the directors believe that a federal "imprimature" would be given to their councils, and that this federal approval would not only increase the stature of the councils, but would help in obtaining additional funds from other federal sources. Thus, the potential beneficiaries of the pilot project see federal recognition as a prime source of both power and legitimacy. At the same time, most of the chairman interviewed expressed skepticism of the concept as it is outlined in The Boundless Resource. "It just won't work," one respondent said. "Corporations are already being taxed to pay for what they consider to be bloated educational agencies. Why should

additional corporate funds and resources be poured into education? As for school districts, they aren't about to give up one iota of their authority. It's a nice concept, but from a political point of view, it's impractical." This comment pretty much sums up the opinions of most of the directors interviewed. It is interesting to note, however, that regardless of their skepticism, most are anxious to take part in the pilot project.

The problem here is how the federal government can reach in to local communities without overreaching itself? The proposers of community-work education councils want a grass roots effort -- a neo-Saul Alinsky type movement -- yet the very fact that the federal government is leading the cheering section and holding out the promise of funds contradicts this objective. But, without the federal imprimatur from what source would the councils draw their authority? From education? From the work sector? From both? It is certain that without the participation of education, the proposed councils would falter, and that the work sector by itself would be considered a biased and therefore ineffective intermediary. Thus, if the proposed councils, are to be effective, the impetus would have to come from both sectors, which leads to the question of incentives.

Incentives for Participation

Participation in community-work education councils would mean the assumption of new responsibilities for all concerned. According to Writz, "the proposal rests...on the conviction that enough people want very much today to reestablish their role in handling their own affairs, that this can be done most meaningfully at the local level, and that the closer tying in of youths' education and what

comes after it is a good assignment to start on."[7] As a generality, this statement rings true, but when applied to specific issues, it loses a good deal of its force. Most Boards of Education throughout the nation hold open meetings, but the only time the public shows up in force is when the sensational -- bussing, sex education, the elimination of athletic programs, potential teacher strikes -- are on the agenda. There is very little evidence that the transition from school to work is a burning issue at the local level. Perhaps, it should be, and perhaps it could be, but the fact is that it is not.

What then would be the incentives for participation in community-work education councils? It would appear that educators would have the strongest incentive, since if the councils were successful, they would receive help from other segments of the community in providing services for students. But, educators are already sponsoring and participating in thousands of similar mechanisms throughout the country. It would have to be shown clearly that community-work education councils had the potential for providing something over and above what is presently being provided by existing mechanisms before the enthusiastic participation of educators could be expected. In addition, it can be anticipated that educators would be wary of any proposal which would threaten their control over educational programs.

As for employers, if there were evidence to show that employers were having major difficulties in hiring well-prepared entry-level workers, or that retraining is a major problem in most business and industrial establishments, employers might be willing to allocate funds and resources -- over and above what they are already contributing to education -- in an effort to solve the problem. In today's loose labor market, however, there is little evidence that this is a

major problem. Can we expect that "corporate social conscience" would provide the incentive? Even Wirtz doubts this: "The primary business of business is still business, and the currency of 'corporate social conscience' is inflated, except as it is based on the more classical corporate self interest."[8/]

Thehistory of labor union participation in educational advisory committees and councils is not one that would inspire confidence in collaboration. In the early days of the Manpower Development and Training Program, trade unions effectively blocked the establishment of programs in occupational areas that were considered apprenticeable, and delayed the full implementation of the Act's on-the-job training provisions for well over two years. A 1966 President's Committee on Manpower report, for example, pointed out that the MDTA program in San Francisco was primarily female, because labor union representatives on San Francisco's MDTA Advisory Committee vetoed programs in traditionally male occupational areas.[9/] A recent report on cooperative education programs in urban areas pointed out that where unions were asked to either participate or help promote work education programs, union demands in return for participation or cooperation, constituted a threat to the entire program.[10/] Finally, unions are adamantly opposed to relaxation of child labor and minimum wage legislation. Indeed, the incentives for union participation could be to block some of the most important suggested activities of the councils.

The answer to these objections, of course, is that the various parties could find <u>some</u> areas where collaboration would be possible. This may be true, but would the resulting activity be substantive, or would it be any more significant than activities which are already

taking place under the sponsorship of existing advisory committees and councils? This would depend on the areas for action selected, and on the degree to which individual council members were motivated to act.

Council Membership

One of the problems that have plagued the architects of past and present advisory committees and councils has been the question of membership. Who should sit on advisory committees or councils? The categories of membership are easy to identify: business and industry, education, labor, community organizations, and the general public. When it comes down to individual selections, however, the process becomes a good deal more complicated. How many businessmen and industrialists would be necessary in order that all employers in a community would be well represented? How many public members would be needed to represent all segments of the general public? Can the Central Labor Council or Building Trades Council speak for all unions in the community. Which of the myriad community organizations should be selected for membership?

The problem is relatively simple at the class or "project" level. For example, it would not be difficult for coordinators or printing trades cooperative education programs to select advisory committees. They would recruit the leading employers of printing trades workers in the community, and representatives of printing trades unions. The functions of the committees would be equally clear: they would advise on curriculum, and provide on-the-job training for students enrolled in the programs.

The problem of selection for more generalized councils, such as the proposed community-work education councils, however, is quite

another matter. Can a large industrial employer (who is apt to be well known and therefore desirable for publication relations reasons) speak for all other employers in the community, or even most of the community's employers. What specifically would the representatives of the various segments of the community be asked to do? The problem is most acute with the proposed community-work education councils, because no single institution is charged with the responsibility for their formation. If, for example, education was the moving force in the establishment of the councils, the selection of members would be based on whatever specific contributions educators throught a broad-based community council could provide. The same would be true if employers, labor unions, or even the general public were the moving forces behind the establishment of the councils. But, with no "core" with no particular agency or institution advocating (for its own reasons) the formation of councils, how would the councils be formed, and if they were formed, who would be selected to sit on them, and what would they do?

With respect to the pilot program, existing councils (variously named) would be selected for participation. In addition to whatever these councils are doing now, their agenda would consist of one or more of the following five broad areas of activities: (1) counseling and advice for students; (2) the provision of occupational information; (3) placement activities; (4) development of the career education concept and education-experience programs; and (5)the establishment of educational interchanges.[11/] Presumably, the councils would apply pressure on existing agencies to provide services, institute action programs on their own, or both. But, the desired membership of councils would depend on which role the councils adopted. If,

for example, the councils adopt primarily the advocate role, the most appropriate membership would be highly prestigious representatives of each sector of the community, regardless of their expertise. If, on the other hand, the councils opt for action "programs," it would be necessary for council members to have expertise in the program areas. Past experience indicates that the latter type council is the most difficult to establish.

Summary

Willard Wirtz, in The Boundless Resource, outlines a prospectus for an Education/Work Policy. He presents a problem and suggests in general terms a solution to the problem. The book is a provocative and eloquent plea for community level action to improve linkages between school and work for both youth and adults. The idea of "collaboration" between institutions at the local level through the establishment of community-work education councils is eminently worthy of consideration. It is an idea, however, that has not as yet been fully developed. The Wirtz prospectus is, as it should be, a call to action, but before action is taken, the proposed program should be given the developmental attention it deserves. Wirtz cites Antigone's counsel: "Until we have tried and failed, we haven't failed." True, but first we ought to know exactly what it is that we are trying.

II

WHAT'S GOING ON

The typical school district in a town or city of the United States has the following:

1. Board of Education
2. Citizens' Advisory Committee (appointed by the Board or local education agency, self-appointed, or both)
3. Advisory Committees on Vocational Education (usually one for each vocational education occupational area)
4. Advisory Committees to Individual Instructors of Vocational Education and Other Classes
5. Parent Teachers' Associations
6. One or More Joint Apprenticeship Committees

In addition, many school districts now have "career education committees," "industry-education councils," and "community resource workshops." If the district is located within an Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I area, it will also have an advisory committee for programs funded under Title I. Finally, most school districts are within the jurisdictions of Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsors, which are required to have advisory committees made up of employers, and representatives of labor, the general public, and community agencies (including education).

Trade associations, individual employers and labor unions contribute materials, participate in work education programs, cooperate in student vocational education and other student clubs and associations.

arrange field trips for both students and teachers, and contribute equipment to the schools.

With all this activity going on in most of the nation's school districts, can it be possible that education is totally isolated from other institutions -- that the schools are completely separate entities, divorced from the work and service sectors of communities? The answer to this question, of course, depends on the extent to which educators make use of existing committees and councils and non-educator contributions, the quality of non-educator participation and contributions, and -- most importantly -- the value of the resulting policies and programs to individual students.

In this section, a review is made of the different types of activities which are presently conducted, their accomplishments (if any), their shortcomings, and the reasons for their success or lack of success. The section concludes with a comparison between what is actually taking place at the present time and with what is contemplated (or hoped for) through the establishment of still another group of local level councils -- the community work-education councils.

The material is organized into two sub-sections: (1) Existing Activity; and (2) The "New Means." The first sub-section is subdivided as follows: (1) Institutional Activities; and (2) Committees and Councils.

Existing Activity

Institutional Activities

It was estimated in 1963 that the dollar volume of instructional materials, visual aids, career literature, posters, and so on, provided to public schools by industry -- trade associations as well

as individual employers -- was over $160 million.[1] This estimate does not include the dollar value of scholarship and fellowship funds nor of contributed time of executives and other industry personnel. There is no doubt that the volume of industry-sponsored and disseminated material for use in schools is now well beyond the 1963 estimate. No estimates are available for labor or other institutional contributions, but -- although a good deal less than industry contributions -- they are considerable. In this sub-section, an appraisal is made of the activities of institutions, acting on their own (outside of committees and councils), in behalf of the public schools.

Business and Industry

The most comprehensive survey of individual company support of public education was made by Robert L. Ayars in 1963 -- before the formation of the National Alliance of Businessmen and the great upsurge in industry participation caused by the riots of the mid-sixties and the resulting manpower programs (most of which were educational) that followed the passage of anti-poverty legislation. Ayars surveyed 248 companies. He found that the most often mentioned contribution was the provision of instructional materials. Close to seven out of ten of the companies prepared and distributed booklets; six out of ten provided filmstrips, slides, transparencies, records and tapes; four out of ten supplied textbooks and company histories; and well over three out of ten furnished samples of raw materials and/or finished products, and a variety of displays and exhibits.[2]

Table 1 shows the frequency of company sponsored instructional services for students, and Table 2 shows the frequency of company sponsored help in upgrading the "real world" knowledge of teachers.

Table 1 indicates that even before the passage of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968, a significant number of companies were participating in work education programs, especially at the college level. Table 1 also indicates that a considerable number of companies, at both the secondary and postsecondary levels, were helping in vocational training, counseling and guidance programs. The amount of company activity at the elementary level, for both students and teachers, was considerable, as were the number of workshops, conferences and seminars for teachers, in which company representatives participated.

Table 1
Instructional Service Provided for Schools

	Elementary	Secondary	College
Student field trips to offices, mills and factories	24%	66%	55%
Classroom and assembly speakers	18%	62%	59%
Student club programs	4%	60%	8%
Student work experience programs	7%	26%	39%
Help in vocational training, counseling, and guidance programs	4%	42%	38%
Student award and recognition programs	3%	29%	18%
Curriculum advisors	4%	22%	19%
Facilities and equipment for meetings	4%	17%	14%
Teachers and professors on loan	4%	5%	16%
Substitute teachers and adult or night school teachers	1%	14%	22%
Student travel programs	(less than)1%	3%	5%
Other programs (seminars, tours, research projects, work-study programs for drop outs, etc.)	2%	6%	6%

Source: Albert L. Ayars "How Business and Industry are Helping Schools" pg. 57, Saturday Review, October 17, 1964).

Table 2
Help in Upgrading Teachers

	Elementary	Secondary	College or Adult School
Plant visits; Business-Industry-Education Day programs	24%	[illegible]	[illegible]
Workshops, conferences, and seminars for teachers	7%	54%	34%
Research and work experience opportunities for teachers	1%	10%	24%
Special classes	1%	2%	3%
Travel programs	1%	2%	1%
Other programs (consultant service, assistance in economic education programs, special trips, and summer employment)	2%	5%	3%

Source: Albert L. Ayars "How Business and Industry are Helping Schools", pg. 57 Saturday Review, October 17, 1964.

A more recent survey by the National Industrial Conference Board of 50 firms involved in providing services to schools (1972) indicated that the degree of involvement ranged from a low of 34 percent who at the time were offering political support to schools in fiscal matters to a high of 83 percent who were providing financial support for specific programs. Half the respondents indicated that they were providing opportunities for students and teachers to observe business and plant operations on a regular basis, and equipment for specific classes.[3/] The businessmen surveyed, however, believed that they could have done more. Some said there was a lack of requests by schools for business help and, in some cases, refusals on the part of schools to use business donated materials. One Southern bank president said that educators refuse to teach "free enterprise economics."[4/]

In 1968, the Conference Board conducted a survey of 1,033 companies to determine their willingness to initiate action on education and training programs. The results, shown in Table 3, indicate that the highest percentage of positive replies pertained to the "retraining of workers rendered unemployed by automation;" the lowest percentage to "improvement of local school curriculum."

Table 3
Company Willingness to Initiate Action on Education and Training Problems

	Percent of Companies					
		By Size			By Industry	
	Total Respondents	Small	Medium	Large	Manu-facturing	Nonmanu-facturing
Number of Companies	(1,033)	(146)	(494)	(393)	(683)	(350)
Improvement and expansion of local school facilities.....	55.6%	59.6%	54.9%	55.0%	56.4%	54.0%
Improvement of local school curriculum.....	48.5%	50.7%	49.4%	46.6%	48.8%	48.0%
Problems associated with school dropouts.....	53.9%	58.9%	52.2%	54.2%	52.7%	56.3%
Improvement of work/career opportunities for minority groups....	62.9%	69.2%	65.2%	74.3%	67.9%	71.7%
Retraining of workers rendered unemployed by automation.....	72.6%	73.2%	70.6%	74.1%	74.1%	69.7%

Source: The National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., The Role of Business in Public Affairs, Studies in Public Affairs No. 2 (New York: The Board, 1968), p. 26.

Trade Associations: Business and industry trade associations generate a large volume of materials and services for the educational system. These range from career education and curriculum materials to the sponsorship of "community resource workshops" (by the American Iron and Steel Institute) and the promotion of industry-education councils by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The latter two organizations have been in the business of providing materials and services to the schools for a

number of years. Both have adopted policies in favor of "career education," and both have sponsored "business-industry days" and other events throughout the country. An interview with the Educational Director of the NAM revealed that more than 100 members of the association are participating in industry-education councils. He indicated, however, that industry participation is pretty much restricte to "Fortune's 500." The former Educational Director of the U.S. Chamber said that business participation in education increases as labor markets get "tighter," or as unemployment rates go down and employers experience difficulties in recruiting and holding workers. He also said that the Chamber's emphasis has shifted from business-industry career days to cooperation in instituting career education curricula.

National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB): Formed in the late 1960s as a partnership between business and the federal government, NAB concentrates mainly on the placement of disadvantaged individuals in jobs. In its earliest stages, executives were loaned to newly established NAB offices throughout the country to get the program off the ground. Working with local employment service personnel, NAB offices developed jobs and filled them with disadvantaged individuals recruited by local employment service offices. Today, the job development and placement program is administered primarily by employment service personnel.

A study performed in 1968 attempted to identify cooperative efforts that had taken place between schools and industry to meet the goals of NAB. The results indicated that the communication link between schools and industry was at best poor and at worst nonexistent.

Businessmen did not know who to contact in the school system, and when they did manage to propose ideas to school administrators, many claimed that they were given "the run around." Others claimed that teachers were interested in business-sponsored education programs, but had difficulty in gaining approval for such programs from their supervisors.[5/]

At the present time, NAB has 130 metropolitan offices throughout the United States which, in addition to their placement activities, sponsor the following youth programs:

1. Youth Motivation Task Force: A program which brings disadvantaged youth in contact with young men and women from business who have similar backgrounds. Its major purpose is to motivate students to remain in school.
2. College Cluster Program: A program to establish clusters of business representatives and college administrators around minority colleges so that the employing community can assist graduates to better compete for jobs in business and industry.
3. Vocational Guidance Institutes: A program, sponsored by local businessmen, for school counselors, administrators and curricula specialists. The goal of these institutes, which are co-sponsored with universities, is to provide educators with a better awareness of minority problems and to become better equipped to counsel students on the types of jobs open to them upon graduation.
4. Guided Opportunities for Life Decisions: A program to provide economically disadvantaged youth with year-round work experiences that will create a greater understanding

of private sector career opportunities and help students chose realistic career goals.

Mr. James F. Grogan, of the Xerox Corporation, in discussing the goals of NAB, stated: "If our nation's businessmen and educators can't find ways to stem the tide (i.e., school dropouts) and to make our educational curriculum valid and relevant in terms of meaningful jobs for everyone, we can only envision the 'Roman Circus' and the predominant welfare state as being grimmer than anything predicted by Gibbon and Orwell."[6/]

Constraints: The extent of voluntary industry participation in education, and the extent to which industry's contributions are accepted by educators, depends on whether constraints, based primarily on mutual confusion and suspicion, can be overcome. Although there is evidence to indicate that polarized positions between industry and education are breaking down, there can be no doubt that communication between the two institutions could be improved. According to Burt, some of the constraining factors stemming from the educational world are:

1. Confusion on the part of school administrators as to what they want from industry.
2. Lack of knowledge on the part of school administrators of how industry is organized or how to approach industry.
3. Suspicion on the part of school administrators of motivations of industry in working with schools.
4. Fear of school administrators that industry groups will become special interest pressure groups.
5. Lack of willingness by school administrators to provide staff to work with industry in developing cooperative

relationships.

6. Overemphasis by school administrators at local, state, and national levels on advisory committees as the sole technique for achieving industry-education cooperation.
7. Lack of understanding by school administrators of the role of the instructor in achieving industry-education cooperation.
8. Lack of coordination of industry participation in the individual schools of the school system by administrators at the central office level.
9. Jealousy of perogatives on the part of supervising staff at both the central office and individual school levels so that industry participation in school programs becomes diffused and relatively impotent.
10. Lack of guidance from state officials, national educational organizations, and the U.S. Office of Education in providing realistic guidelines and adequate staff to enlist and encourage industry participation in school matters.[7/]

As for industry, Burt lists the following:

1. Confusion concerning the mission of public education, school organization and how to work effectively with school people.
2. Unwillingness to make long-range committments to volunteer services to schools, thus creating among educators a sense of impermanency and resulting self-seeking motivations on the part of industry.
3. Too quick to disillusionment on the part of industry when school officials take a cautious approach to industry-

initiated cooperative programs.

4. Lack of planned organization, assignment of staff, and budgeted funds on the part of industry to effectively channel and implement its desire to be involved in work with schools.
5. Lack of knowledge and leadership on the part of industry as to what it may rightfully demand, as a matter of public policy, from the public schools.[8/]

Summary:

Although it is true that the constraints listed above inhibit interaction between education and industry, it is equally true that cooperative (and perhaps even "collaborative") programs have been and are being developed and that many of them are in the areas of suggested activities for the proposed community-work education councils. Education and Industry are, indeed, "independent sovereignities," but there is considerable "commerce" between them. It is highly doubtful that either sector will -- or should -- give up its independence, but total isolation is not a condition now and it is not likely to be in the future. Perhaps more extensive collaborative relationships can be developed between the two sectors, but there is always the problem of striking a balance. One recalls the angry criticisms of college students during the sixties to the effect that our nation's colleges and universities were nothing more than "farm clubs" for industry.

Labor Unions

Labor unions enter into collaborative relationships with schools in the conduct of apprenticeship programs, cooperate in some work

education programs, and provide texts and materials for use in the nation's classrooms. In recent years, however, unions have had difficulties in supporting some educational programs involving cooperations between schools and the work sector, and have been in outright opposition to suggestions that labor standards legislation be relaxed to permit increased employment of youth. A recent study of cooperative education programs in urban areas, for example, pointed out that schools refrained from requesting union help in the inauguration of cooperative programs, because they feared union demands would be impossible to meet.[9/] The Los Angeles Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, issued a "Statement of Position on Community Involvement in Vocational Education," which may be typical of the attitudes of most union officials and members toward work education programs. Such programs, the statement reads, should have advisory committees which include labor representation. Unions should be consulted on the initiation of new programs and be assured that regular workers will not be displaced. In addition to receiving school credit and the minimum wage, students who participate in work education programs should be extended the benefits of social security and unemployment insurance. Finally, "there should be periodic reviews and reports by school personnel of places of employment and conditions of labor. Such reports should be given to each member of program advisory committees." Although the Los Angeles statement appears eminently reasonable, it could be viewed as a threat by both school officials and employers.[10/]

The AFL-CIO has been cool to proposed career education programs, and does not promote local union participation in industry-education councils. Unions do not view "youth unemployment" apart from total

unemployment, and are therefore wary of programs to cure unemployment for any segment of the population which do not attack the basic economic causes of unemployment.

Nevertheless, while unions remain involved in their traditional basic functions, they are today expanding these functions to participation in broad social movements. The AFL-CIO's program for the 1970s includes efforts to resolve ghetto and innercity problems, and aid to the rural poor and others bypassed by society. This emphasis on social aims is in response to the broader interests and social consciousness of new members coming into the unions -- government workers (especially teachers) and blacks. One important factor which may have an effect on education-union relations is that there are presently 4,000 school districts throughout the United States which have collective bargaining arrangements with teachers' unions.

Despite the cool reception given career education by the national office of the AFL-CIO, the United Automobile Workers (UAW) and the United Rubber, Plastic and Linoleum Workers of America have issued statements supporting career education, and there has been a good deal of local union participation in career education programs in New York State, Springfield, Massachusetts and Peoria, Illinois. One of the most interesting of the many union-education cooperative programs is the UAW's assignment of 27 retired skilled craftsmen as advisors in the vocational education departments of 19 inner-city Detroit schools. The advisors attempt to acquaint and motivate students concerning the opportunities and advantages of becoming skilled craftsmen, and assist youth in preparing to take apprenticeship examinations.

Summary: Unions have been participating in educational programs

throughout the history of the American labor movement, and it can be expected that their participation will increase in the future. However, care must be taken that the goals of proposed programs are not inimical to union interests. If, for example, proposed community-work education programs are billed as panaceas for youth unemployment, or if they include among their objectives programs which unions consider contrary to the interests of American workers (such as the modification of labor standards legislation), little cooperation (or collaboration) can be expected from the labor movement.

National Citizens Groups

Since the 1960s, a number of national organizations have been formed to enlist the various facets of our national life, on a voluntary basis, to help in developing human resources. Among them are The Urban Coalition, The National Committee for the Support of Public Schools, and the Joint Committee on Economic Education (which was founded in 1949). Although the overall objectives of these organizations are broad, programs in support of public education are one of their major goals.

Urban Coalition: In the field of education, the Urban Coalition, which is made up of political, social, religious and industrial leaders, has sponsored programs in three large cities -- New York, Philadelphia and Los Angeles. The three local Coalitions are involved primarily in the development of industry-school cooperative programs in the inner-city areas.

National Committee for the Support of Public Schools: Founded in 1962, the National Committee is composed of leaders in business, labor, agriculture and the professions, and is financed entirely by volunteer tax-deductible contributions from individuals, industries,

and foundations. Its primary purpose is to provide facts and insights regarding public education so that its members, reflecting all shades of opinion, can intelligently work out solutions to meet the needs of their own schools.

Joint Committee on Economic Education: The Joint Council on Economic Education was organized in 1949 with the support of the Committee for Economic Development and from the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education. The entire program of the Council is to: "reduce economic illiteracy by improving the quality of economics taught in our schools and colleges -- by trained teachers using effective teaching materials." There are over 50 affiliated councils in 46 states which work with local school systems and colleges to develop programs founded on local needs.

These are only a few of the national groups which are engaged in the support of public education; countless others exist at the state and local levels.

Summary

This brief review of industry/labor/citizen group interaction with the public school system indicates that the schools are receiving considerable support from other private and public institutions. Unfortunately, no comprehensive evaluation of such support has ever been made. As a result, the question as to its usefulness is generally determined by the biases of observers. Industry criticizes the schools for not making use of business-generated materials; the schools criticise industry for grinding its own axe; and labor criticises both education and industry for reasons of its own. Yet, all three sectors -- plus citizens' groups -- join in cooperative and collaborative efforts in most of the nation's school districts.

Perhaps these efforts are not all that they should be, but by any stretch of the imagination it cannot be said that complete isolation exists between them.

Committees and Councils

It is impossible to estimate the total number of committees and councils either sponsored by public schools or appointed by other groups (including self-appointed citizens' committees) to advise or pressure the schools on various matters in existence today, but the number must be more than 100,000. It is estimated that there are over 20,000 formally organized vocational education advisory committees alone, and this figure does not include advisory committees to individual vocational education and/or work education classes.[11/] Indeed, it would be interesting to know the amount of time educators spend meeting and working with advisory committees and councils. The number of committees and councils has increased dramatically since the 1960s, because most federal legislation passed during that turbulent period mandated the establishment of advisory committees or councils, and because of pressure from local groups for increased participation in the formation of local school district policies and decisions.

It would be impossible in this paper to review the activities of all committees and councils which are active in school matters today; thus, the decision was made to concentrate on three types of advisory groups: (1) Vocational Education Advisory Committees; (2) Industry-Education Councils; and (3) Federally mandated manpower advisory councils. These types of committees are most closely associated with the transition of students from school to work and the movement of adults from work and other adult roles back into school.

Vocational Education Advisory Committees

Vocational education advisory committees are of three types: (1) General; (2) Departmental; and (3) Specific Occupation. Most school districts throughout the United States have one or more of these types of committees. Their membership consists of employers, labor unions, community and governmental organizations, representatives of various segments of the general public, and, of course, vocational educators. Although their functions are quite similar to those suggested for the proposed community-work education councils, the process through which advisory committees operate is definitely not "collaborative." An American Vocational Education Association (AVA) booklet on advisory committees, before describing the functions of advisory committees, states what their purpose is not:

> "The functions of the local advisory committee can best be established by stating first what the group is not to do. The numerous provinces which invite participation outweigh the areas closed to committee operation and prevent this approach from being negative....The duties of advisory committees should extend beyond giving advice, but the members have neither legislative nor administrative authority..... Formation of these committees is not intended to usurp the perogatives of boards of education or of administrative staffs, but occasionally such fears are articulated. Because the approval and support of the board members and staff are vital, they must be assured that, while the danger is present and some advisory committees have tried to move in that direction, the barriers will be firmly placed."[12/]

Once having made this distinction, the AVA goes on to explain the functions of advisory committees as follows:[13/]

1. Occupational Surveys: "Advisory committees should advise the school administration on the types of offerings required to satisfy the prepatory as well as the retraining and upgrading needs of the individuals of the community." To do this properly, advisory committees should either conduct occupational surveys, or see to it that they are conducted.
2. Verification of Course Content: Advisory committees should establish practices "which will keep instruction practical and functional."
3. Support for Proposed Legislation: Advisory committees should "support educators in the important area of legislation and appropriations."

One vocational educator cites the following functions as ways in which advisory committees can help the educator:

1. Make community surveys;
2. Determine and verify need for training;
3. Provide tangible evidence that industry is supporting the program;
4. Review past accomplishments and forecast trends affecting training and employment;
5. Evaluate the programs;
6. Provide financial, legislative and moral support;
7. Interpret the program to the community, to unions, to employers;
8. Plan facilities and establish standards for shop and lab training;

9. Secure donations of equipment and supplies;
10. Identify new technical developments which require changes in the curriculum;
11. Encourage teaching recruits;
12. Provide guidance and support in technical matters;
13. Determine qualifications needed for selecting instructors;
14. Counsel and guide students in relation to the world of work;
15. Find placement opportunities for students;
16. Determine criteria for evaluating student performance; and
17. Develop cooperative work experience programs for students.[14/]

If many of the above listed functions appear to be the same as those proposed for community-work education councils, it is because they are the same. The question, of course, is how well have these functions been carried out by advisory committees. No evaluation has been devoted exclusively to the performance of vocational advisory committees at the local level. However, many assessments of vocational education programs in general have commented on the contributions of advisory committees. The consensus appears to be that the closer advisory committees are attached to specific classes, or occupational areas, the more effective they are apt to be.

Specific Occupation or Class Advisory Committees: In all the discussion about the transition of students from school to work, the role of the instructor or coordinator at the "firing line" level is all too often ignored. Most students, especially vocational education students, receive the vast majority of their counseling from instructors, who in turn, are required in most states to have had practical experience in the trades they teach in order to be qualified as vocational education instructors. Instructors also play a major

role in the placement of students, and in following up on students after placement. Specific occupation or class advisory committees are invaluable to instructors in carrying out these functions. The advantages of these types of committees are that their purposes are clearly delineated:

1. To advise on curricula and equipment for specific occupational areas or classes;
2. To provide equipment where it is needed;
3. To advise on job opportunities in the occupational area;
4. To provide work stations for cooperative and other work education students; and
5. To provide full-time jobs for graduates.

Asked to name the characteristics of <u>active</u> and <u>involved</u> advisory committees, the coordinators of 30 cooperative education programs in urban areas replied that such committees, composed of high level business or industrial representatives, should meet often and perform at least two major functions: (1) employer relations and job development; and (2) curriculum development and revision. Members of such ideal committees would visit classrooms, provide advice on how training could be improved, talk with students individually, and make presentations to classes as a whole.[15/]

<u>Departmental Advisory Committees:</u> These committees serve each occupational area (or cluster) of a vocational education program in a school district or school. Their value depends on the extent to which demands are made on the committees by school districts or schools. The coordinators mentioned above rated 15 out of 30 of their departmental advisory committees in some way useful; the remainder were of little use (at least to school coordinators).[16/] According

to the coordinators interviewed, the value of a good departmental advisory committee is that it either performs functions that coordinators otherwise would have to perform, or that it helps coordinators in performing key functions. For example, in Houston, departmental advisory committees draft lists of employers, by occupational area, that have expressed an interest in participating in secondary cooperative education programs. These lists are distributed to coordinators for job development purposes. The New York City Co-operative Education Commission meets six times a year to deal with program promotion, the development of new work stations, and problems that arise in the area of city-wide employer and labor relations. A committee for a Boston fashion merchandising program, composed of 27 representatives of department stores in Washington, D.C., New York City and Boston, not only lends status to the program, but also assures the development of adequate work stations, placement for graduates, and provides advise in maintaining up-to-date curricula.

What little evidence exists, however, indicates that the performance of departmental advisory committees is uneven throughout the country.

General Advisory Committees: General advisory committees assist in the development and maintenance of the entire vocational education program of a school or school district. General committees are the farthest removed from the "firing line," and their purposes or functions are the least clearly delineated. It would be expected that the major responsibility for the generation of local labor market information -- across the broad occupational spectrum -- would be vested in general advisory committees. However, there is little

evidence that such committees engage in this function, or if they do, the results do not reach local education agency personnel responsible for planning, or school counselors and instructors. The major purposes of general advisory committees appear to be of a public relations nature. The prestige of their memberships lend validity to the overall programs, they assist the schools in legislative and appropriations matters, and sponsor events which focus public attention on vocational education programs.

Limitations of Advisory Committees: One of the major limitations of vocational education advisory committees, especially of "general" variety is that the membership is not often chosen according to the expertise needed to carry out committee functions. What appears to be happening in many cases is a "prestige exchange." Businessmen, labor representatives and members of other segments of the community consider service on advisory committees something of a status symbol, and educators, by appointing prestigous members of the community to advisory committees, gain public acceptance for their vocational education programs. The result is that committees are often made up of individuals who agree with each other and who do not expect to devote much time to committee matters other than the time they spend at meetings. Even more important, the more complicated functions of advisory committees, such as the generation of local labor market information through occupational surveys, are often ignored. However, these are limitations which apply to all kinds of voluntary activities, including those of industry-education councils and the proposed community-work education councils.

Industry-Education Councils

The term "industry-education councils" is used here to denote a number of variously named councils, committees, workshops, partnerships, etc., that have come into being over the years, not necessarily through the initiative of educators, and that are concerned with the total educational program, rather than any particular type of education, such as "vocational education." Although in their earliest days, some of these organizations were formed to improve educational programs in specific fields (such as science and engineering after the Sputnik scare), most are now embracing the "career education" concept. The prime movers of the industry-education movement have been industrialists and their associations, such as the N.A.M. Labor participation has not been extensive, and participation by educators has been characterized by caution and, at times, outright reluctance. Although participation by individuals as parents, rather than as representatives of institutions, has been non-existent in most industry-education type organizations, because the impetus for the establishment of industry-education councils has occurred for the most part outside the school system, they have been afforded the attributes of "citizens' movements."

There are two national associations of industry-education councils, one of which dates back to 1964: The National Association of Industry Education Council (NAIEC), and the Industry Education Councils of America (IECA).

The NAIEC was established in 1964, although its beginnings date back to the 1940s when it was known as the Business-Industry Section of the National Science Teacher Association. Its purposes are as follows:

1. To provide a national organization for representatives of business, industry, education, government and labor to promote increased levels of cooperation;
2. To identify areas of mutual interest and to formulate programs and procedures which meet acceptable standards; and
3. To communicate with any group concerned with education about cooperative programs and projects.

The NAIEC has approximately 250-300 members composed of educators, individual firms and national trade associations. Recently, the organization merged with the National Community Workshop Association, an organization made up primarily of educators. Previous to the merger, the NAIEC's membership was primarily from the business and industry sectors; it is now composed of equal representation from the education and business-industry sectors.

The IECA is a relatively new organization of California and Arizona industry-education councils. Its purposes are as follows:

1. Establish a clearinghouse to stimulate a better understanding of interrelationship of schools and industry;
2. Encourage the formation of statewide or regional groups to develop programs at the local level;
3. Develop leadership at the state or regional levels for the implementation of programs and activities at the community level;
4. Interchange information concerning ongoing programs and to develop methods for their implementation at the state or regional level;
5. Hold regional meetings, seminars and the like for interchange

of information for the benefit of all concerned; and

6. Encourage long-range planning to carry out the above mentioned objectives.

There are approximately 40 industry-education councils presently in operation (mainly in New York and California); the number of similar mechanisms (variously named) is unknown. In preparation for the writing of this paper, representatives of both the NAIEC and IECA, the directors of seven industry-education councils, and six similar mechanisms were interviewed. The purposes of the interviews were to determine the history of individual councils, their memberships, paid staffs, financing, activities, problems, views regarding "collaboration" versus "cooperation," and the possible effects of federal intervention in what has been primarily a local initiative.

History: Of the 13 councils whose directors were interviewed, seven were initiated primarily by industry, five by education, and one by a public group. The reasons for the establishment of the councils, although varied, were primarily concerned with the transition of students from school to work (although one was formed solely to provide supplementary education for employed adults). One had its beginnings in the post-Sputnik scare, one in the student unrest of the sixties, four in response to the career education concept, and two in the concept of using community resources in educational programs. Others were inspired by testimony at a statewide hearing on public education, the need felt by some industrialists in one community to promote the teaching of free enterprise economics in the public schools, the result of a labor market survey (by the Chamber of Commerce) which showed a need for better business linkages with the public schools, and the need for teacher training in some communities.

Council Memberships: Two of the councils had no formalized structure; five limited membership to business and industrial representatives; three were composed of business and education representatives; two included labor representatives in addition to business and education members and one included community agency members in addition to business, labor and education; and one was made up of political office holders as well as business and labor representatives.

Paid Staffs: All but three had paid staffs. The average number of staff members was three, but one had seven full-time staff members, and one had a staff of 13 full-time and 10 part-time employees.

Financing: Five of the councils were financed by state and local education agencies, but in three of these instances, industry provided in-kind contributions. Industry provided all of the funding for five of the councils, but in one instance, local education agencies provided in-kind contributions. One council was funded jointly by industry and education, and one was the recipient of a federal grant. In two of the councils funded solely by education agencies, one also received a federal grant and one was the recipient of contributions from the general public.

Activities:

Among the activities of the councils were the following:

1. Sponsorship of Job Fairs and other "events" (e.g., career days, testimonial dinners, teacher and student award ceremonies, etc.)
2. Sponsorship of conferences on legislation
3. Sponsorship of NAB-model Career Guidance Institute (two councils)

4. Development of economic education programs (two councils)
5. Development of community resources for use by schools (two councils)
6. Development of career education programs for students and the promotion of resources for use in career education programs (five counsels)
7. Development of teacher training programs (three councils)
8. Program to provide supplementary education for adult workers (non-high school graduates) on job-sites
9. Promotion of Community resource workshops
10. The generation of local labor market information (two councils
11. Miscellaneous provision of services to schools on request

Problems: Only four of the respondents identified problems of any substantive nature. One said that it was impossible to arrive at a consensus as to what the objectives of the council should be (this council had 60 members from business, labor and education). As a result, council activities were carried out on an ad hoc basis. Suspicion by educators was cited as a problem by one respondent. "They think we're out to indoctrinate pupils in the free enterprise system," he said, "but we're dealing with that. They're beginning to come around." One council suffered a loss of funding for political reasons, the nature of which the director was unwilling to disclose. One respondent mentioned three problems: (1) the education members turn out in force for meetings, whereas attendance by industry members is sparse; (2) teachers in some school districts appear to be hostile to industry contributions; and (3) because of a battle at the state level between vocational and career education divisions, it is difficult to gain the cooperation of vocational education personnel

(this counsel was primarily career education oriented).

Most respondents, however, said that they were "problem-free," which may be an indication that no substantive attempts had been made to achieve a collaborative relationship with the schools (see below).

Collaboration Vs. Cooperation: Respondents were asked whether they were familiar with The Boundless Resource and proposals for the establishment of community-work education councils that would involve collaboration between education and other community institutions. Seven respondents were acquainted with the book and the proposal, and four were hopeful of receiving pilot project grants. One of the respondents, quoted in Section I of this paper, was outspoken in his skepticism of the idea (yet he was one of the respondents hoping to receive a pilot project grant). The remainder, though less outspoken, were nevertheless cautious in response to the question of collaboration. "Educators are already suspicious of us," one respondent said, "we've got to prove our motives are pure." Another said that in order for true collaboration to take place, there would have to be a "third force," or "demands on the part of the general public" for changes in educational responsibility.

Effects of Federal Intervention: Since several of the councils were already receiving federal grants, and other hoped to be federal grant recipients, it is not surprising that all but one of the council directors saw no conflict in federal financing of "grass roots" programs. One director, however, was adamantly opposed to federal financing of industry-education councils. "Federal funds would be a crutch and crutches are only for cripples." He believed that the whole idea of community efforts to improve local education programs

would be compromised by federal funding. This respondent constituted a minority of one, and his council was made up solely of industry representatives. Most of the remaining respondents believed that federal recognition (through grants) would lend prestige to the programs and would lead to additional funding possibilities.

Summary

Industry-education councils are a relatively new phenomenon on the educational scene (although some have been in existence for a number of years), and represent a desire and willingness on the part of non-educational institutions (primarily industry) to contribute expertise and resources to the education of American students. There is no indication at this time, however, of collaborative relationships between councils and schools -- in the sense of sharing policy and operational decisions for educational programs -- and there is even less indication that there is a groundswell of "public interest" -- or the interest of individuals in their private, non-institutional capacities as parents and citizens -- in the work of the councils. The councils represent primarily a response to the career education concept on the part of industry and, to a lesser extent, labor unions and other institutions and agencies. Their activities are directed toward the total educational program, rather than toward specific segments of it (such as academic or vocational education), but the activities themselves are not much different than those performed by vocational education and other educational advisory committees presently in operation.

Manpower Advisory Committees

Ever since the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962, educators, employers, union members and representatives of other community institutions and agencies have participated in manpower advisory and/or planning committees. Several of these committees, such as Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) committees and today's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) state and local committees have attempted to coordinate community manpower resources for both youth and adults, and bring about increased cooperation, if not collaboration, between private and public sector institutions. It would be an understatement to say that these federally mandated structures were not altogether successful, and that one of the major reasons for their failure was institutional polarization. For example:

-- In the early days of MDTA, labor was often pitted against the Employment Service and local education jurisdictions in the generation of proposals for institutional and on-the-job training programs.

-- Shortcomings of the CAMPS system, which was under the overall jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Labor (through the Employment Service), were due primarily to the unwillingness of other agencies (federal, state and local) to be bound by a system dominated by the Employment Service (or Labor Department).

-- Concentrated Employment Programs (CEP), which attempted to accomplish in ghetto areas what CETA is now attempting to do in larger jurisdictions, were often hampered because employers, unions and other agencies were reluctant to

work with Community Action Agencies, the prime sponsors of local CEPS.

It is interesting to note, however, that following the riots of the 1960s, local MDTA adivsory committees lost a considerable amount of their power and in many cases went out of business altogether. The result was that MDTA institutional and OJT programs underwent an expansion, and unions began to institute pre-apprenticeship programs, using MDTA money. What happened? It seems that public pressure, or the demands of individuals acting as citizens, interceded in what had been primarily an under-publicized battle between institutions. Something had to give in the case of the MDTA program it was labor opposition. The point is that unless the consciousness of the public is raised, or unless the public is concerned about specific problems which are being aggravated by institutional polarization, there is very little pressure on institutions to change their positions, or to compromise in order to effect potential solutions to the problems.

All this, of course, is past history; the best that can be done is to understand its lessons. For present purposes, however, it might be well to take a look at the current mechanism designed to achieve cooperation and coordination of manpower programs at the local level -- CETA.

CETA

The Comprehensive Manpower and Training Act mandated that two types of advisory bodies be established: (1) State Manpower Services Councils; and (2) Prime Sponsor CETA Planning or Advisory Councils. According to a 1975 evaluation of coordinated linkages among manpower programs, neither of these advisory bodies have had an impact in

coordinating manpower programs at either the state or local levels.[17/] State Manpower Services Councils have been concerned primarily with grants to the states mandated by CETA, and local advisory committees or councils have apparently been established merely to meet CETA requirements. The relationship of the local committees to the program planning and decision making process is often obscure and poorly defined.

The evaluation upon which the above remarks were based, however, was conducted in 1975. As CETA was passed in 1973, many of the programs reviewed had been in existence for only a short period of time. A new study, which will not be completed until January, 1977 (and in which the author of this paper is participating), indicates that in some areas significant contributions are being made by State Manpower Services Councils. Perhaps the most important is in the area of local labor market information. For example, in California and Georgia, contracts have been entered into between state CETA offices and State Employment Security Departments to provide local labor market information for CETA prime sponsors. In California, the research and statistics division of the Employment Development Department (Employment Service) sponsored a conference for all local prime sponsors to determine their needs with regard to local labor market information. Regular reports and projections will be supplied to prime sponsors on a monthly basis.

This is an encouraging development. The provision of local labor market information has never been considered a high priority by the U.S. Department of Labor, or its Bureau of Labor Statistics. A 1972 evaluation of the effectiveness of MDTA in meeting employers's needs in skill shortage occupations noted: "A major finding and con-

clusion of this report is that no system exists for defining or identifying skills shortage occupations at the local level, despite the introduction of computerized data gathering systems, the existence of a national industrial matrix, the methodologies for forecasting national occupational needs, applicant information (including unemployment insurance transactions), and other valid sources of information. No system exists for synthesizing and storing occupational information emanating from many sources. For the most part, the research and statistics staffs of Employment Security agencies are operating as field staffs to generate aggregate data that are used in identifying national or state trends; they are not providing staff services to the operating arms of the Employment Service. As a result, planning is left to those least capable of understanding complicated information gathering systems and methodologies for identifying demand or skills shortage occupations, or for making occupational forecasts."[18/]

The same report also pointed out that the presence of employers on advisory committees and councils does not assure the generation of local labor market information. Based on interviews with more than 300 employers in 14 cities, it was concluded that most employers do not make occupational projections and have little knowledge of community labor market needs, as differentiated from the needs of their individual firms. "Everyone seems to agree," the report noted, "that employers should participate in the planning process for all manpower programs, but if individual employers do not use forecasts and do not have much knowledge of employer manpower requirements other than their own, the question as to how they should be used is very pertinent indeed. Certainly, the addition of two or three

employers to an advisory committee is not going to be of much help to planners in identifying training occupations, other than those that the employers know about in their own firms."[19]

The fact is that the provision of labor market information to local communities could be accomplished in a very short period of time if trained state, regional and local Employment Service research and statistics staff were given the assignment. It is doubtful that this will occur as long as such personnel are considered field staff for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is encouraging, however, that the use of state CETA funds (not local prime sponsor funds) are being used, in some states at least, to finance the generation -- by professionals -- of much needed local labor market information.

The "New Means"

The "New Means" suggested in The Boundless Resource would be a tri-partite council, consisting of representatives of education, the work sector, and the "community" (presumably parents, students and civic leaders). The councils would be called community-work education councils, and one of their first tasks would be to provide for "an independent, toughminded process for critical evaluation, to be initiated when the project is started and carried on through to cover every element of failure as well as success."[20]

Relying essentially on community initiative, council functions would include "both the rendering of services directly to youth and the 'brokering' of functions of established institutions -- particularly schools, employing enterprises, labor unions, employment agencies, and families."[21] Council agenda would include:

1. Counseling -- Advice to Students

2. The Development of Local Occupational Information
3. The Development of a School Placement Service and Follow-Up System
4. Advancement of Career Education and Education-Experience Programs
5. Promotion of Educational Interchanges (or new methods of alternating education and experience)

The one, distinctive characteristic of the proposed community-work education councils is that they would be initiated by "communities as a whole," rather than by institutional segments of the community. Their first task would be to provide for evaluations of what presently exists; presumably, their future agenda would be based on the results of these evaluations.

There is no doubt that there is a need for an assessment of present mechanisms designed to facilitate the transition between school and work. In fact, such an assessment should be conducted before a new institution is imposed on those already existing in the nation's communities. The activities suggested for the proposed community-work education councils are already being performed by a variety of committees and councils, but reliable information on how well existing mechanisms are working is woefully lacking. Arguments to the effect that high youth unemployment rates, or the existence of special jobs for youth, are an indication of how poorly youth are being prepared for work, beg the question. High unemployment rates (for youth, older workers, or individuals in their prime working years) are a reflection of economic conditions, and the existence of special jobs for youth may be more of an indication of the existence of a transitional process rather than the abscence of

one. What is needed is evidence that "poor preparation" (which is directly attributable to school deficiencies) is a significant factor in limiting the career horizons of youth, or barring their entry into the work force.

If it could be proved that this is the case, it would be much easier to martial local support for community-work education councils.

III

CRUCIAL ISSUES

In Section I of this paper, seven issues relating to ideas and assumptions underlying the proposed establishment of community-work education councils were identified. They were as follows:

1. Are the causes of youth unemployment economic in nature, and if so, how can manipulation of the educational system result in a lower youth unemployment rate?
2. Is the reason why more adults do not seek educational renewal caused by isolation between education and the work sector, or is there a lack of demand on the part of adults for reenrollment in education and retraining programs?
3. Can "collaboration" as opposed to "cooperation" between education and other institutions at the community level take place under existing conditions, or would there have to be a groundswell of public demand for the sharing of educational responsibilities?
4. Should not the term "community" be more clearly defined if the proposed councils are to initiate activities in such areas as the generation of local labor market information and placement?
5. From the federal point of view, wouldn't there have to be joint funding of councils in order that no one segment of the community would exert undue influence on council policy and decisions?

6. Is there sufficient concern on the part of the general public, employers, parents and students regarding the transition from school to work (and work to school) to promote genuine interest in the establishment of community-work education councils?

7. Who or what agency or group would be responsible for establishing councils, who would be selected for membership, and what would be the basis for selection -- public relations (or advocacy), expertise, or both?

The above can be subsumed into four major issues: (1) Community Interest; (2) the Question of Isolation; (3) the Question of Poor Preparation; and (4) the Federal Role. Each are discussed below.

Community Interest

The proposal for the establishment of community-work education councils is based on the assumption that the general public is deeply concerned with the question of education-work policies -- that individuals in their private capacities as parents and citizens are demanding a new approach to the transition between school and work and/or between work and other adult roles and school. While it is true that there is a great deal of concern about the quality of the educational system in general, there is little evidence to indicate that this specific issue is of priority concern to parents, students, civic leaders and others who represent the public interest. Few blame the educational system for high unemployment rates, and few unemployed youths blame their inability to obtain entry-level positions on deficiencies in the educational system. In other words, either rightly or wrongly, people are not conscious of the problem. If this is indeed the case, the outlook for establishing tri-partite

councils, primarily on the initiative of communities acting as whole, are not bright. The evidence seems to indicate that the major impetus for the formation of industry-education councils has come from the business sector -- not from the general public.

The Question of Isolation

The charge that education and the work sector are totally isolated from one another is an exaggeration. Two out of three members of local school boards are representatives of management, and a significant number are members of labor unions. Well over 100,000 businessmen and labor representatives serve on advisory committees to schools and school districts, and the contributions of industry to education amount to well over $200 million a year. The number of advisory committees to vocational education alone is in excess of 20,000, and industry (and to a lesser extent labor) officials are enthusiastically supporting the development of career education programs. It may be that communication between education and the work sector could be improved, but it is not accurate to state that they operate in total isolation. The crucial question is whether it is advisable to superimpose another council over the maze of committees and councils that already exist, or to seek improvement in the operation of presently existing mechanisms.

The Question of Poor Preparation

The charge that students are not well prepared to make the transition from school to work is not often supported with facts. Most of the arguments in support of this allegation -- high youth unemployment rates, the existence of special jobs for youth, restrictive labor standards legislation -- are unrelated to the educational process

or to the interaction between education and the work sector. What is needed is evidence that student inability to obtain jobs is directly related to deficiencies in school or school-work programs. Perhaps, before a new institution is formed, an assessment should be made of presently existing school-work linkages at the community level. The results of such an assessment would provide objective information regarding the strengths and deficiencies of existing systems, and the basis for possible future action.

The Federal Role

The objective of the pilot project is to encourage the formation of community work-education councils without at the same time creating the impression that the project is, in Paul Barton's words, "just another avenue for obtaining federal support." Furthermore, since the councils will not necessarily have objectives, in the traditional sense of that term, but will "discover purpose in the course of experiencing activity,"[22/] federal evaluation efforts will be difficult. Finally, since it is hoped that the councils will be community initiatied (with only a small nudge from the federal government), there doesn't appear to be a federal role over and above the initial funding of the project and consortium. About all interested federal officials can do is sit back and wait for a year or two before going in to see whether any of the possible "results," hypothesized by Barton, have actually happened.

Notes

1. Samuel M. Burt and Leon Lessinger, Volunteer Industry Involvement in Public Education (Mass: Heath Lexington Books Co., 1970) p. 1.

2. Harmon Ziegler, Kent H. Jennings and Wayne G. Peak, Governing American Schools (Mass: Duxbury Press, 1974) p. 28.

3. American Vocational Association, The Advisory Committee and Vocational Education (Washington,D.C: AVA publication) p. 6.

4. Willard Wirtz, The Boundless Resources: A Projection for an Education-Work Policy (Washington, D.C: The New Republic Book Co., 1975) p. 1.

5. Ibid., p. 76.

6. Ibid., p. 8.

7. Padraic Colum, et. al., The Irish Rebellion of 1916 and its Martyrs (New York: The Devin Adair Co., 1916) pp. 274-275.

8. Percy Krich, "Education-Servant of Industry," School and Faculty Summer, 1969, New York City, pp. 280-281.

9. Joseph F. Dinneem, The Purple Shamrock, (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1949) p. 47.

10. Stephen P. Hayremen and William Daniels, Adolescence Research Opinion and National Youth Policy: What we Know and What we Don't Know (draft) A summary of a workshop held by DHEW, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, p. 7.

11. Ibid., p. 8.

12. Miriam Johnson, Counterpoint (Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Co.,1973) p. 176.

13. Paul E. Barton, "Community Councils for the Transitions between Education and Work," (A paper written for the National Institute of Education) p. 11.

14. Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, Community Resources for Career Education (a report on two mini-conferences held in 1975-76 by the Office of Career Education, USOE, under contract with the Center for Vocational and Technical Education) p. 1.

15. Paul E. Barton,Opt.Cit., p. 22.

Section I

1. Cameron Buchanan, Education and Work Linkages: Discussion Paper (An initial paper done for National Institute of Education) p. 6.

2. Sar A. Levitan and Robert Taggart, "The Economics of Youth Unemployment in the United States," Economic Topic Series (The Joint Council on Economic Education, 1975) pp. 6-7.

3. Ibid, p. 7.

4. Paul E. Barton, "Community Council for the Transitions Between Education and Work," (A paper written for the National Institute of Education) p. 33.

5. A Pilot Study for Apprenticeship System (San Francisco: Olympus Research Corporation) May, 1975.

6. Paul E. Barton, Op. Cit pp. 18-19.

7. Willard Wirtz, The Boundless Resources: A Projection for an Education-Work Policy (Washington, D.C: The New Republic Book Co., 1975) p. 75.

8. Ibid., p. 64.

9. "Report Highlights-San Francisco Coordinating Team," President's Committee on Manpower,May, 1966, pp. 2-3.

10. John J. Walsh and Vincent J. Breglio, An Assessment of School Supervised Work Education Programs Part II: Urban Cooperative Work Education Programs and Follow-Up Study (San Francisco: Olympus Research Centers, 1976) pp. 166-167.

11. Willard Wirtz, Op. Cit., pp. 66-76.

Section II

1. Albert L. Ayars, "How Business and Industry are Helping the Schools," Saturday Review, October 17, 1964, p. 58.

2. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

3. G. J. Finley, "Business and Education: A Fragile Partnership," The Conference Board (Report No. 586) 1973, pp. 5-6.

4. Ibid.

5. Trudy W. Banta, "Why Aren't Non Schools Involved in NAB Programs?" American Vocational Journal, October 1969, pp. 21-22.

6. Samuel M. Burt, et. al., Op. Cit., p. 50.

7. Samuel M. Burt and Leon M. Lessinger, Volunteer Industry Involvement in Public Education (Mass: Heath Lexington Books Co., 1970), p. 8.

8. Ibid., p. 9.

9. John Walsh and Vincent J. Breglio, An Assessment of School Supervised Work Education Programs Part II: Urban Cooperative Work Education Programs and Follow-up Study (San Francisco: Olympus Research Centers) Contract No. OEC-0-74-8718, March, 1976, p. 167.

10. Ibid., pp. 166-167.

11. American Vocational Association, The Advisory Committee and Vocational Education (Washington, D.C: AVA publication) p. 6.

12. Ibid., p. 17.

13. Ibid., p. 17-22.

14. Ibid., p. 22.

15. John Walsh, et. al., Op. Cit., p. 128.

16. John Walsh, et. al., Op. Cit.

17. Coordinated Linkages Among Manpower Programs: The Role of HEW-Funded Programs Under CETA Part II (Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Centers, 1975) p. 46.

18. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employers' Needs in Skills Shortage Occupations (Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Corporation, 1972) Pursuant to Contract Number 83-49-71-03, p. 23.

19. Ibid., pp. 236-237.

20. Willard Wirtz, An Education-Work Policy (Washington, D.C: - The New Republic Book Co., 1975) p. 65.

21. Ibid., p. 75.